# DP-IQA: Utilizing Diffusion Prior for Blind Image Quality Assessment in the Wild

Honghao Fu<sup>1\*</sup>, Yufei Wang<sup>1\*</sup>, Wenhan Yang<sup>2</sup>, Bihan Wen<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore <sup>2</sup>PengCheng Laboratory, China {hfu006, yufei001, bihan.wen}@ntu.edu.sg yangwh@pcl.ac.cn

#### Abstract

Blind image quality assessment (IQA) in the wild, which assesses the quality of images with complex authentic distortions and no reference images, presents significant challenges. Given the difficulty in collecting large-scale training data, leveraging limited data to develop a model with strong generalization remains an open problem. Motivated by the robust image perception capabilities of pre-trained text-to-image (T2I) diffusion models, we propose a novel IQA method, diffusion priors-based IQA (DP-IQA), to utilize the T2I model's prior for improved performance and generalization ability. Specifically, we utilize pre-trained Stable Diffusion as the backbone, extracting multi-level features from the denoising U-Net guided by prompt embeddings through a tunable text adapter. Simultaneously, an image adapter compensates for information loss introduced by the lossy pre-trained encoder. Unlike T2I models that require full image distribution modeling, our approach targets image quality assessment, which inherently requires fewer parameters. To improve applicability, we distill the knowledge into a lightweight CNN-based student model, significantly reducing parameters while maintaining or even enhancing generalization performance. Experimental results demonstrate that DP-IQA achieves state-of-the-art performance on various in-the-wild datasets, highlighting the superior generalization capability of T2I priors in blind IQA tasks. To our knowledge, DP-IQA is the first method to apply pre-trained diffusion priors in blind IQA. Codes and checkpoints are available at https://github.com/RomGai/DP-IQA.

### 1 Introduction

Millions of images are uploaded and spread across the internet daily (Madhusudana et al. 2022). Inevitably, some of these images are of poor quality, causing negative impressions due to their visual defects (Chiu, Zhao, and Gurari 2020). Image Quality Assessment (IQA) evaluates the visual quality of images from a human perspective, to ensure high-quality content for applications such as social media sharing and streaming (Saha, Mishra, and Bovik 2023). Therefore, the robustness and generalization of IQA methods against various real-world distortions significantly impact the presentation of billions of images to the public. Blind IQA (BIQA) methods, also known as no-reference IQA, are crucial for evaluating



Figure 1: Motivation of our work: Unlike commonly used classification priors, the pretrained T2I model can simultaneously capture both high-level semantic features and low-level distortions, making it a more effective prior for blind IQA.

image quality without reference images. In diverse and uncontrolled real-world environments ("in-the-wild"), BIQA is particularly necessary due to the unpredictable distortions present. Unlike methods that require reference images, BIQA directly predicts image quality, which is essential for handling authentic distortions. However, labeling the dataset to train BIQA models is laborious because it requires multiple volunteers to provide subjective scores for each image to avoid bias, resulting in a smaller scale of the dataset compared to other tasks like image classification (Hosu et al. 2020).

To increase the generalization ability of BIQA models under limited data, the majority of recent BIQA methods (Ke et al. 2021; Golestaneh, Dadsetan, and Kitani 2022; Qin et al. 2023; Saha, Mishra, and Bovik 2023; Xu et al. 2024; Agnolucci et al. 2024) leverage priors from pre-trained image classification models. These priors emphasize high-level vision and consequently lack adequate low-level information, which creates potential barriers and increases the difficulty for the model in learning low-level features. This issue arises because, during classification training, images with similar high-level content but differing low-level quality are assigned the same label (Zhao et al. 2023a). Furthermore, using networks pre-trained for classification does not align well with human visual perception of image quality (Zhang

<sup>\*</sup>These authors contributed equally.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Corresponding Author

et al. 2023). Humans can recognize and classify objects in an image even if it is distorted, as long as the distortion is not too severe. Therefore, recent research (Wang, Chan, and Loy 2023; Zhang et al. 2023; Peng et al. 2024) leverages the prior knowledge of visual-language multimodal models for BIQA tasks, reducing reliance on classification priors. An advanced approach involves constructing a set of text templates that describe both the high-level content and low-level quality of the input images, and utilizing the visual-language model CLIP (Radford et al. 2021) to obtain feature embeddings for both the image and corresponding text. The similarities among them are used as metrics to further measure the image quality. However, recent research reveals that CLIP image encoder is largely insensitive to various distortion types (Luo et al. 2023), demonstrating effective performance only with a limited set of distortions (blurry, hazy, and rainy). Furthermore, the image encoder compresses complex images into vectors, potentially leading to the loss of low-level information. Therefore, the current methods utilizing CLIP priors for BIQA still have limitations. This prompts us to explore whether BIQA could benefit from more ideal priors offered by other tasks and models.

As shown in Figure 1, inspired by the robust image perception capabilities of text-to-image (T2I) diffusion models, we propose leveraging diffusion priors for blind IQA (BIQA). While a few recent studies have explored using diffusion models (Li et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2024) for BIQA, they still rely on pre-trained classification models and do not fully utilize the large-scale pre-trained T2I priors. Priors from pre-trained T2I diffusion models have been effectively applied to highlevel tasks such as image classification (Li et al. 2023) and semantic segmentation (Tian et al. 2023; Zhao et al. 2023b), as well as low-level tasks like super-resolution (Wang et al. 2023) and image restoration (Xiao et al.; Fei et al. 2023; Guo et al. 2023). This further confirms that diffusion priors encompass a rich blend of high-level and low-level information. Furthermore, employing a T2I model like Stable Diffusion (SD) (Rombach et al. 2022) avoids processing distorted images through the CLIP image encoder, which is insensitive to various distortions. Instead, it only utilizes the CLIP text encoder to condition the T2I model, which can accurately embed text descriptions of image distortions. However, despite these advantages, unlike IQA methods based on pre-trained classification models or CLIP, which can directly obtain feature vectors from the models' output layer, how to effectively extract features for IQA tasks from T2I diffusion models remains an open problem.

In this paper, we explore the potential of T2I diffusion models and adapt them to better address in-the-wild BIQA with various unpredictable authentic distortions. We propose a novel BIQA method called diffusion prior-based IQA (DP-IQA). DP-IQA leverages a pre-trained SD model as the backbone, extracting multi-level features from the denoising U-Net at a specific timestep and decoding them to estimate image quality, without requiring a whole diffusion process. A text adapter is used to address the potential domain gap caused by our constant conditional embedding strategy, while an image adapter corrects information loss from the variational autoencoder (VAE) bottleneck. To more effectively utilize the T2I model's image understanding and global modeling capabilities, DP-IQA processes the entire image without patch splitting, allowing for better extraction of semantic features. Unlike T2I models that require full image distribution modeling, our approach focuses on image quality assessment, which inherently requires fewer parameters. Consequently, we distill the knowledge from this model into a CNN-based student model, significantly reducing parameters to enhance applicability. Experiments demonstrate that DP-IQA achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance and superior generalization ability across various in-the-wild datasets. To the best of our knowledge, DP-IQA is the first method to apply T2I diffusion priors in BIQA. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We are the first to leverage the pretrained T2I diffusion model's prior for blind IQA, specifically its strong ability to model semantic and low-level features simultaneously.
- We propose a framework that can better extract aestheticsrelated features from activation values during the diffusion denoising step, resulting in a more compact and effective representation for subsequent prediction. Besides, the enhanced T2I diffusion priors are distilled into a lightweight model for enhanced applicability, achieving  $\sim 3 \times$  speed up and  $\sim 14 \times$  reduction in parameters under similar performance.
- The extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness and generalization ability of the proposed method on several in-the-wild benchmarks with authentic distortions.

## 2 Related Works

## 2.1 Blind image quality assessment

Traditional BIQA primarily leverages statistical features from the spatial and transform domains of images using natural scene statistics(Moorthy and Bovik 2010, 2011; Gao et al. 2013; Ghadiyaram and Bovik 2017) and employs machine learning models for the regression of image quality score(Xue et al. 2014; Saad, Bovik, and Charrier 2010; Sadiq et al. 2020). However, these methods often fail to capture high-level image information due to their reliance on specific feature computations. Recently, deep learning has advanced BIQA significantly (Ghadiyaram and Bovik 2014; Kang et al. 2014; Ying et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2018; Zhu et al. 2020; Zhao et al. 2023a). Initial methods used Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) to learn image quality features (Ma et al. 2017; Pan et al. 2018), while recent works (You and Korhonen 2021; Ke et al. 2021) propose to leverage powerful Vision Transformer (ViT) (Dosovitskiy et al. 2020) for better performance.

To address the challenge posed by the limited scale of IQA datasets hindering the models' representational capabilities, utilizing priors from classification models pre-trained on larger-scale image datasets like ImageNet is a commom practice (Kim et al. 2017; Bianco et al. 2018; Gao et al. 2018; Varga, Saupe, and Szirányi 2018; Su et al. 2020; Golestaneh, Dadsetan, and Kitani 2022; Qin et al. 2023; Xu et al. 2024; Zhao et al. 2023a; Agnolucci et al. 2024). However, as discussed in the previous section, it exhibits significant differences from human visual perception habits. There are also some works avoid using pre-trained classification models. For example, early generative models such as Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) have been applied to IQA tasks (Lin and Wang 2018; Zhu et al. 2021; Ren, Chen, and Wang 2018). GAN-based methods typically reconstruct an undistorted image from a distorted one, then extract features from this process, or use the reconstructed image as a reference for IQA. Consequently, they require undistorted reference images during training, which limits their applicability to inthe-wild images without references. More recent works, such as CLIP-IQA (Wang, Chan, and Loy 2023), LIQE (Zhang et al. 2023) and IPCE (Peng et al. 2024), adopt the priors of vision-language model CLIP for BIQA. They perform IQA by minimizing the cosine similarity between the CLIP embedding of the image and the CLIP embedding of text describing its content and quality. However, as stated in the previous section, the CLIP image encoder is not sensitive to a large number of distortion types, while its text encoder can accurately embed text describing these distortions, leading to a mismatch between image and text embeddings (Luo et al. 2023). Therefore, applying CLIP priors to in-the-wild BIQA may still have limitations.

Recently, a few studies have applied diffusion models to BIQA. PFD-IQA (Li et al. 2024) trains a diffusion model to denoise prior features of images obtained through pre-trained ViT and performed regression on the denoised features to predict quality scores. Diff $V^2$ IOA (Wang et al. 2024) trains a diffusion model on 2 small-scale synthetic distortion datasets to restore distorted images to high-quality images, and uses ViT and ResNet to obtain the features of intermediate denoised images from the denoising process to predict quality scores. However, due to the poor performance of its selftrained diffusion model, the restored images significantly deviate from the original images, introducing new distortions not accounted for in the datasets' scoring system. Additionally, since the synthetic distortion datasets contains only a limited number of distortion types, the self-trained diffusion model lacks robustness to complex real-world distortions. Overall, existing diffusion-based methods still rely on pretrained classification models like ViT or ResNet, and have to train a new diffusion model without utilizing the priors of large-scale pre-trained diffusion models.

### 2.2 Diffusion model priors

Diffusion-based generative models excel in generating highquality images with intricate scenes and semantics from textual descriptions, demonstrating a profound understanding of text and vision. The prior knowledge embedded in large-scale pre-trained diffusion models like SD has proven effective for high-level visual tasks such as image classification (Li et al. 2023), semantic segmentation (Tian et al. 2023; Zhao et al. 2023b), and depth estimation (Zhao et al. 2023b; Ke et al. 2023). Additionally, it has also been utilized in low-level tasks like super-resolution (Wang et al. 2023) and image restoration (Xiao et al.; Fei et al. 2023; Guo et al. 2023), showing impressive results. This indicates that the diffusion priors contain sufficient high-level and low-level information with no significant barriers between them. However, diffusion models have a large number of parameters and incur high computational cost, hindering their deployment in real-world scenarios. Thus, we distill the knowledge from the trained DP-IQA model into a smaller pre-trained vision model.

## 3 Method

## 3.1 Preliminary

**Diffusion.** As the backbone of our proposed DP-IQA, we first provide a brief introduction to the principles of diffusion models. Let  $z_t$  be the random noise at the *t*-th timestep. Diffusion models transform  $z_t$  to the denoised sample  $z_0$  by gradually denoising  $z_t$  to a less noisy  $z_{t-1}$ . The forward diffusion process is modeled as:

$$q(z_t \mid z_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(z_t; \sqrt{\alpha_t} \, z_{t-1}, (1 - \alpha_t) \mathbf{I}), \qquad (1)$$

where  $\{\alpha_t\}$  are fixed coefficients that determine the noise schedule. By defining  $\bar{\alpha}_t = \prod_{s=1}^t \alpha_s$ ,  $z_t$  can be obtained directly from  $z_0$  (Baranchuk et al. 2021):

$$q(z_t \mid z_0) = \mathcal{N}(z_t; \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} \, z_{t-1}, (1 - \bar{\alpha}_t) \mathbf{I}), \qquad (2)$$

$$z_t = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t} \, z_0 + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t} \, \epsilon, \quad \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}). \tag{3}$$

It makes sampling for any  $z_t$  more efficient. With proper reparameterization, the training objective of diffusion models can be derived as (Ho, Jain, and Abbeel 2020; Zhao et al. 2023b):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm DM} = \mathbb{E}_{z_0,\epsilon,t} \left[ \|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(z_t(z_0,\epsilon), t; \mathcal{C})\|_2^2 \right], \qquad (4)$$

where  $\epsilon_{\theta}$  is a denoising autoencoder that is learned to predict  $\epsilon$  given the conditional embedding C. In our task, the denoising autoencoder  $\epsilon_{\theta}$  is a U-Net,  $z_t$  is a latent representation of a distorted image, which can also be regarded as a latent variable that has not been fully denoised from random noise. By controlling the conditional embedding C, we enable the denoising U-Net to effectively extract different features from  $z_t$ , and thereby extract the prior knowledge required for the IQA task from a single timestep in the diffusion process.

### 3.2 Overview

We adapt the representation capabilities and priors of T2I diffusion models to BIQA in the wild, as illustrated in Figure 2. Specifically, the input image is first encoded with a pre-trained VAE encoder, then fed into the denoising U-Net of the pre-trained SD (Rombach et al. 2022). Concurrently, a CLIP encoder (Radford et al. 2021) converts text describing the image quality into conditional embeddings for the denoising U-Net. The input text is templated and consistent across all images. Meanwhile, text and image adapters are adopted to mitigate the domain gap caused by the constant conditional embedding strategy and correct the information loss caused by the VAE bottleneck. Subsequently, we extract feature maps from each stage of the U-Net's upsampling process, which are then fused and decoded by a well-designed Quality Feature Decoder (QFD). Finally, a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) is employed to regress the image quality scores. Figure 3 provides details on the adapters and QFD. After obtaining the above teacher model, we distill the knowledge in the trained DP-IQA into an EfficientNet-based (Tan and Le 2019) student model, which is initialized with the official



Figure 2: Framework of DP-IQA and its corresponding student model by knowledge distillation. DP-IQA is the teacher model, which assesses image quality based on the features extracted from the pre-trained denoising U-Net at a single timestep. Then, we distill the knowledge from DP-IQA into a student model with EfficientNet as the backbone to further reduce parameters and increase inference speed. The loss functions are detailed in equation (11) and (12).

pre-trained weights, and its output structure is modified to align with the teacher model. The distillation process leverages two sources of supervision: (1) the output feature map from the QFD, and (2) the GT image quality scores.

Extracting diffusion priors from a single timestep. A pretrained T2I diffusion model contains sufficient information to sample from the data distribution, including its low-level features and structures, as the model can be viewed as the learned gradient of data density (Zhao et al. 2023b). With limited natural language supervision during pre-training, the T2I model also incorporates significant high-level knowledge. Recent research 1-DAE (Chen et al. 2024) has revealed the representation capability of denosing diffusion model is mainly gained by the denoising-driven process, not a diffusion-driven process. It indicates that the representation capability of the pre-trained denoiser can be adequately utilized with a singlestep denoising process, without requiring a diffusion process. Therefore, we only need to select a single timestep for our task. We utilize the pre-trained SD as our backbone. Assume we wish to utilize the diffusion priors expressed by the denoising U-Net  $\epsilon_{\theta}$  at timestep t. For an input image  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ , it is encoded into latent representation  $z_t$  by a pre-trained VAE. Then, from  $\epsilon_{\theta}(z_t, t)$ , we obtain the feature maps  $f_{up}^i$ at each upsampling stage, where i = 1, 2, 3, 4. The resulting

set of feature maps  $F_{up}^t = \{f_{up}^{t,1}, f_{up}^{t,2}, f_{up}^{t,3}, f_{up}^{t,4}\}$  is the prior features at t.

**Text template.** In a T2I diffusion model, text is converted into conditional embeddings by a text encoder to guide the denoising process. SD uses a CLIP encoder for embedding text. An appropriate text prompt is crucial for the denoiser to focus on the target features. We use a general text template summarized by previous CLIP-based art (Zhang et al. 2023) to describe the image's content and quality as the text conditional input. The template is "a photo of a {scenes} with {distortion type} distortion, which is of {quality level} quality." Considering that text descriptions cannot cover all possibilities, we suggest including "other" for both scenes and distortion types. We present the specific settings of the template in Appendix A. Assuming there are  $l_s$  scenes,  $l_d$  distortion types, and  $l_q$  quality levels, there are a total of  $K = l_s \cdot l_d \cdot l_q$  combinations. We define  $\mathcal{T}$  as the set of all combinations, where  $\mathcal{T}_k$  is the k-th sentence in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

**Constant conditional embedding.** Benefiting from the conditional embedding characteristics of the T2I diffusion model, our method does not require setting specific text template content for each input image. Instead, it inputs all the template combinations simultaneously. In the CLIP encoder  $E_C$  of the T2I diffusion model, an input prompt is split into multiple tokens (77 in SD by default, which can be modified). Define the



Figure 3: Details of (a) text adapter, (b) image adapter (Mou et al. 2024) and (c) quality feature decoder in DP-IQA.

output dimension of  $E_C$  as d, then each token is converted into an  $1 \times d$  embedding. The embeddings of all tokens are concatenated  $(77 \times d)$  as the condition, influencing the attention mechanism. This allows us to treat each sentence in our template as a separate token, combining them into a universal constant condition embedding in our task, prompting the U-Net to be able to focus on all the distortion scenarios it needs to pay attention to. In practice, each sentence is first split into tokens, and the embeddings of all its tokens are average pooled to produce a vector with the same shape as the embedding of a single token  $(1 \times d)$ , which represents the global embedding of a sentence. The pooled results of Ksentences from the template  ${\mathcal T}$  are then concatenated to form an overall embedding with shape  $K \times d$ , which is simplified to  $E_C(\mathcal{T}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$ .  $E_C(\mathcal{T})$  will be used as a constant in our task to provide a universal conditional embedding. Therefore, we can apply all combinations of text template to an image at once, which helps the model better understand an image with multiple scenes and distortions

#### **3.3** Diffusion prior-based IQA (DP-IQA)

**Text adapter.** However, our conditional embedding strategy slightly differs from the standard strategy of pre-trained SD, which may lead to the potential domain gap. Therefore, we use a text adapter (Zhao et al. 2023b; Zhou et al. 2022; Gao et al. 2024) to mitigate it. The text adapter consists of a two-layer MLP  $A_T$ , and takes  $E_C(\mathcal{T})$  as input. The output of  $A_T$  is then added to  $E_C(\mathcal{T})$  to obtain the adjusted conditional embedding  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$ . This process is:

$$\mathcal{C} = E_C(\mathcal{T}) + A_T(E_C(\mathcal{T})).$$
(5)

**Image adapter.** Since the VAE was not specifically trained on distorted images, it may lose distortion information when encoding images into latent space. Retraining a VAE on distorted images is prohibitively expensive, so we use an image adapter  $A_I$  to extract additional features from the image x. These features are fed into the denoising U-Net's downsampling process, which was initially designed to control low-level details in T2I generation (Mou et al. 2024). We find this approach works well to supplement low-level distortion information. Define the feature map at each downsampling stage as  $f_{down}^i$ , where i = 1, 2, 3, 4. The set of the feature maps at timestep t is  $F_{down}^t = \{f_{down}^{t,1}, f_{down}^{t,2}, f_{down}^{t,3}, f_{down}^{t,4}\}$ . Define the output of the image adapter as  $A_I(x) = F_{adp}^i$   $\{f_{adp}^1, f_{adp}^2, f_{adp}^3, f_{adp}^4\}$ , which is independent of the timestep t, and the size of  $f_{adp}^i$  is consistent with  $f_{adp}^{t,i}$ . The process of feature supplementation by the image adapter is:

$$F_{\text{down}}^{t,i} = F_{\text{down}}^{t,i} + F_{\text{adp}}^{i}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$
 (6)

Quality feature decoder (QFD). We design a CNN-based QFD D to decode the feature maps from the upsampling stages, and then regress the output of the decoder through an MLP to obtain the image quality score. QFD first accepts  $f_{up}^{t,1}$ ,  $f_{up}^{t,2}$ ,  $f_{up}^{t,3}$ ,  $f_{up}^{t,4}$  in  $F_{up}^t$  as input, and upsamples all of them to a size of 64×64. Next, a convolution layer and a squeezeand-excite (SE) layer are used to unify the channel number to 512 for each feature map, and the four feature maps are concatenated into a single feature map with 2048 channels. This concatenated feature map is then processed through four convolution layers to gradually reduce the number of channels to 512, 128, 32, and 8. The QFD finally outputs an image quality feature map of size  $64 \times 64 \times 8$  as  $F_{\text{quality}} =$  $D(F_{up}^t)$ . The  $F_{quality}$  is flattened into a one-dimensional vector and passed through a regression network R, which consists of a three-layer MLP, to perform score regression and obtain the predicted value  $y_p$ . The process is as follows:

$$F_{\text{quality}} = D(F_{\text{up}}^t) = D(f_{\text{up}}^{t,1}, f_{\text{up}}^{t,2}, f_{\text{up}}^{t,3}, f_{\text{up}}^{t,4}),$$
(7)

$$y_p = R(\text{Flatten}(F_{\text{quality}})).$$
 (8)

**Model optimization.** Our model is trained in an end-to-end manner. The loss function consists of Mean Squared Error (MSE) loss  $\mathcal{L}_{mse}$  and Margin loss  $\mathcal{L}_{mgn}$ , which are commonly used for learning image quality score regression and ranking (i.e., distinguishing the quality relationship within a batch) in IQA. Assuming the batch size is n, the GT image quality score is y, the predicted value is  $y_p$ , and the standard deviation of y is  $\sigma_y$ , the loss functions are as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm mse} = \frac{1}{n} \|y - y_p\|_2^2, \tag{9}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm mgn} = \frac{2\sum_{i < j} \max\left(0, -\text{sign}(y_i - y_j) \cdot (y_{p_i} - y_{p_j}) + m\right)}{n(n-1)}$$
(10)

where  $m = \lambda \sigma_y$ ,  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore, the overall loss function  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$  can be defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}(y, y_p) = L_{\text{mse}}(y, y_p) + L_{\text{margin}}(y, y_p).$$
(11)

This model is referred to as the "teacher model", and its loss function can also be written as  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{teacher}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}(y, y_p)$ .

## 3.4 Knowledge distillation

**Student model.** Unlike T2I models that require full image distribution modeling which requires a large network capcacity, our approach focuses on image quality assessment, which inherently requires fewer parameters. To reduce the model's parameters and increase inference speed, we propose distilling the feature distribution of DP-IQA into a student model. We use a lightweight EfficientNet as the student model and adjust its output structure to align with that of the teacher model. By distillation, the student network only needs to learn the prior that corresponds to the image quality assessment.

Dataset	CL	IVE	Ko	nIQ	LIV	EFB	SPAQ	
Metrics	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC
DIIVINE (Saad, Bovik, and Charrier 2012)	0.591	0.588	0.558	0.546	0.187	0.092	0.660	0.599
BRISQUE (Mittal, Moorthy, and Bovik 2012)	0.629	0.629	0.685	0.681	0.341	0.303	0.817	0.809
ILNIQE (Zhang, Zhang, and Bovik 2015)	0.508	0.508	0.537	0.523	0.332	0.294	0.712	0.713
BIECON (Kim and Lee 2016)	0.613	0.613	0.654	0.651	0.428	0.407	-	-
MEON (Ma et al. 2017)	0.710	0.697	0.628	0.611	0.394	0.365	-	-
WaDIQaM (Bosse et al. 2017)	0.671	0.682	0.807	0.804	0.467	0.455	-	-
DBCNN (Zhang et al. 2018)	0.869	0.851	0.884	0.875	0.551	0.545	0.915	0.911
MetaIQA (Zhu et al. 2020)	0.802	0.835	0.856	0.887	0.507	0.540	-	-
P2P-BM (Ying et al. 2020)	0.842	0.844	0.885	0.872	0.598	0.526	-	-
HyperIQA (Su et al. 2020)	0.882	0.859	0.917	0.906	0.602	0.544	0.915	0.911
TIQA (You and Korhonen 2021)	0.861	0.845	0.903	0.892	0.581	0.541	-	-
MUSIQ (Ke et al. 2021)	0.746	0.702	0.928	0.916	0.661	0.566	0.921	0.918
TReS (Golestaneh, Dadsetan, and Kitani 2022)	0.877	0.846	0.928	0.915	0.625	0.554	-	-
DEIQT (Qin et al. 2023)	0.886	0.861	0.934	0.921	0.645	0.557	0.921	0.914
CLIP-IQA (Wang, Chan, and Loy 2023)	0.832	0.805	0.909	0.895	-	-	0.866	0.864
ReIQA (Saha, Mishra, and Bovik 2023)	0.854	0.840	0.923	0.914	-	-	0.925	0.918
LoDa (Xu et al. 2024)	0.899	0.876	0.944	0.932	0.679	0.578	0.928	0.925
Ours (student)	0.902	0.875	0.944	0.926	0.671	0.567	0.923	0.920
Ours (teacher)	0.913	0.893	0.951	0.942	0.683	0.579	0.926	0.923

Table 1: Comparison of our proposed DP-IQA with SOTA BIQA algorithms on authentically distorted (in-the-wild) datasets. Bold entries indicate the top two results. '-' are not available publicly.

Training on	LIV	EFB	CLIVE	KonIQ
Testing on	KonIQ	CLIVE	KonIQ	CLIVE
DBCNN	0.716	0.724	0.754	0.755
P2P-BM	0.755	0.738	0.740	0.770
HyperIQA	0.758	0.735	0.772	0.785
TReS	0.713	0.740	0.733	0.786
LoDa	0.763	0.805	0.745	0.811
Ours (student) Ours (teacher)	0.767 0.771	0.758 <b>0.770</b>	<b>0.781</b> 0.766	0.830
ours (teacher)	0.771	0.770	0.700	0.055

Table 2: Comparison of SRCC on cross datasets setting, *i.e.*, we test and report the performance of models on unseen datasets. Bold entries indicate the top two results.

**Model optimization.** The student model takes the image as input and uses the output feature map  $F_{\text{quality}}$  from the QFD as supervision to distill the image quality knowledge learned by the teacher model, we use the MSE shown in Equation (9) as the distillation loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disti}}$ . Additionally, the student model is supervised by the GT image quality score y. Assuming the last feature map before the output layer of the student model is  $F_{\text{student}}$ , the predicted value of student model is  $p_{\text{ps}}$ , the loss function  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{student}}$  for the student model can be defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{student}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{disti}}(F_{\text{quality}}, F_{\text{student}}) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}(y, y_{\text{ps}}) \qquad (12)$$

# 4 Experiment

## 4.1 Datasets and evaluation metrics

**Datasets.** IQA datasets primarily consist of distorted images paired with quality scores. We assess our DP-IQA using four in-the-wild IQA datasets: CLIVE (Ghadiyaram and Bovik 2015), KonIQ (Hosu et al. 2020), LIVEFB (Ying et al. 2020) and SPAQ (Fang et al. 2020), containing 1162, 10073, 11125, and 39810 authentically distorted images, respectively.

**Evaluation metrics.** Consistent with other works, we use Pearson's linear correlation coefficient (PLCC) and Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient (SRCC) as performance evaluation metrics. Their values range from 0 to 1, and a higher value indicates better performance.

#### 4.2 Implementation

We implement our model using PyTorch and conduct training and testing on an A100 GPU. The version of stable diffusion is v1.5, while EfficientNet-B7 served as the backbone for the student model. We use Adam as the optimizer. The teacher model is trained with a batch size of at least 12, an initial learning rate of  $10^{-5}$ , for up to 15 epochs, while the student model with 24,  $10^{-4}$  and 30, respectively. Learning rate decay differ slightly across datasets, as detailed in Appendix B. We also provide more detailed settings in Appendix C. For data preprocessing, we resize in-the-wild images to  $512 \times 512$ pixels without patch splitting. We randomly split datasets into training and testing sets in 8:2, and repeat the splitting process five times for all datasets and report the median results. We show standard deviation of the results in Appendix D.

#### 4.3 Comparison against other methods

**Overall comparison.** We compare our method with 17 SOTA baselines<sup>1</sup>. Table 1 shows the overall performance

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Preprints and works w/o released code are not included in the comparison. Besides, we do not include comparisons with works that use customized experimental settings, such as joint training on multiple datasets or other conditions.

Dataset	F	ull	w/c	o TP	w/o	CCE	w/c	o TA	w/o	o IA
PLCC SR	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	
CLIVE	0.913	0.893	0.867	0.871	0.898	0.878	0.907	0.881	0.904	0.875
KonIQ	0.951	0.942	0.929	0.931	0.937	0.928	0.941	0.940	0.946	0.932

Table 3: Ablation analysis of text prompt (TP), constant conditional embedding (CCE), text adapter (TA) and image adapter (IA) in teacher model. Bold entries indicate the best results.

				1	limeste	p				
Dataset		1	:	5	1	0	2	20	5	50
	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC
CLIVE	0.913	0.893	0.913	0.893	0.912	0.879	0.913	0.879	0.907	0.871
KonIQ	0.951	0.942	0.947	0.939	0.945	0.936	0.946	0.936	0.942	0.931

Table 4: Ablation analysis of the settings of timestep for teacher model. Bold entries indicate the best results.

comparison across 4 standard in-the-wild datasets. The result of DEIQT (Qin et al. 2023) is based on our reproduction, and other results are from LoDa (Xu et al. 2024) and TReS (Golestaneh, Dadsetan, and Kitani 2022). The experimental results indicate that our method achieves the best performance on CLIVE, KonIQ, and LIVEFB, while it also achieves highly competitive performance on SPAQ, which is very close to the best one.

**Generalization ability.** The practical application value of a model is positively correlated with its generalization capability. In Table 2, to test the model's generalization capability for authentic distortion, we conduct cross-dataset zero-shot performance evaluations on three in-the-wild datasets. Following other works, we use the training data of one dataset for training while testing is conducted on the complete datasets of other unseen datasets. We compare our method with other SOTA baselines that have reported model generalization capability, and the experimental results show that our method has the best generalization capability in most cases. Besides, the student model's performance is generally similar to that of the teacher model but with much fewer parameters, indicating that it has considerable practical value.

## 4.4 Ablation

**Text prompt and adapters.** As shown in Table 3, we explore the impact of text prompt and constant conditional embedding strategy, and "w/o CCE" means using the description in the template that best matches the current image content as input, rather than using all templates. Additionally, we also conduct ablation studies on the text and image adapters. When there is no text prompt (w/o TP), the text adapter was not activated by default. The results indicate that the text prompt, constant conditional embedding strategy, image adapter, and text text adapter play positive roles in overall performance.

**Timesteps.** We observe the impact of different timestep settings on model performance. As shown in Table 4, using smaller timesteps is generally more advantageous.

Multi-level features. As shown in Table 15, we conduct abla-

Dataset	F	ull	w/o	$f_{\mathrm{up}}^{t,1}$	w/o	$f_{\rm up}^{t,2}$	w/o	$f_{\rm up}^{t,3}$	w/o	$f_{\rm up}^{t,4}$
Duniber	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC
CLIVE KonIQ	0.913 0.951	0.893 0.942	0.909 <b>0.951</b>	0.891 0.939	0.904 0.947	0.875 0.941	0.897 0.945	0.874 0.936	0.910 0.949	0.893 0.942

Table 5: Ablation analysis of multi-level features, where the timestep t = 1. Bold entries indicate the best results.

Dataset	Distilled	l student	w/o distillation loss		
	PLCC	PLCC SRCC		SRCC	
CLIVE	0.902	0.875	0.717	0.715	
KonIQ	0.944	0.926	0.881	0.841	

Table 6: Ablation analysis of the distillation loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disti}}$ . Using the distillation can significantly improve the performance than training using  $L_{\text{teacher}}$  under the same lightweight backbone. Bold entries indicate the best results.

Model	Time (s/image)	Params
DP-IQA (teacher)	0.023	1.19B
Distilled student	0.006	81.01M

Table 7: The average time spent per image on our hardware platform and the number of parameters between our teacher and student model.

tion analysis on the multi-level feature extraction strategy. We find that each level of features positively impact the results, with  $f_{up}^{t,2}$  and  $f_{up}^{t,3}$  being potentially more important. **Distillation.** As shown in Table 16, we conduct an ablation analysis on the distillation process. Experimental results indicate that distillation effectively enhances the performance of the student model. The results demonstrate the effectiveness of distilling enhanced priors from DP-IQA compared with training from scratch. A comparison of the number of parameters and inference speed is shown in Table 7, where our student model achieves similar performance with  $\sim 3 \times$  speed up and  $\sim 14 \times$  size reduction.

### 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel BIQA method based on large-scale pre-trained diffusion priors for in-the-wild images, named DP-IQA. It leverages pre-trained SD as the backbone, extracting multi-level features from the denoising U-Net during the upsampling process at a specific timestep and decoding them to estimate image quality, without requiring a diffusion process. To alleviate the computational burden of diffusion models in practical applications, we distill the knowledge from DP-IQA into a smaller EfficientNet-based model. Experimental results show that DP-IQA achieves SOTA on various in-the-wild datasets and demonstrates the best generalization capabilities. We believe our exploration can provide a new technical direction for future works and inspire future efforts to more effectively leverage diffusion priors for better assessment of image perceptual quality.

# References

Agnolucci, L.; Galteri, L.; Bertini, M.; and Del Bimbo, A. 2024. Arniqa: Learning distortion manifold for image quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 189–198.

Baranchuk, D.; Rubachev, I.; Voynov, A.; Khrulkov, V.; and Babenko, A. 2021. Label-efficient semantic segmentation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.03126*.

Bianco, S.; Celona, L.; Napoletano, P.; and Schettini, R. 2018. On the use of deep learning for blind image quality assessment. *Signal, Image and Video Processing*, 12: 355–362.

Bosse, S.; Maniry, D.; Müller, K.-R.; Wiegand, T.; and Samek, W. 2017. Deep neural networks for no-reference and full-reference image quality assessment. *IEEE Transactions on image processing*, 27(1): 206–219.

Chen, X.; Liu, Z.; Xie, S.; and He, K. 2024. Deconstructing denoising diffusion models for self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14404*.

Chiu, T.-Y.; Zhao, Y.; and Gurari, D. 2020. Assessing image quality issues for real-world problems. In *proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 3646–3656.

Dosovitskiy, A.; Beyer, L.; Kolesnikov, A.; Weissenborn, D.; Zhai, X.; Unterthiner, T.; Dehghani, M.; Minderer, M.; Heigold, G.; Gelly, S.; et al. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2010.11929.

Fang, Y.; Zhu, H.; Zeng, Y.; Ma, K.; and Wang, Z. 2020. Perceptual quality assessment of smartphone photography. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 3677–3686.

Fei, B.; Lyu, Z.; Pan, L.; Zhang, J.; Yang, W.; Luo, T.; Zhang, B.; and Dai, B. 2023. Generative diffusion prior for unified image restoration and enhancement. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 9935–9946.

Gao, F.; Yu, J.; Zhu, S.; Huang, Q.; and Tian, Q. 2018. Blind image quality prediction by exploiting multi-level deep representations. *Pattern Recognition*, 81: 432–442.

Gao, P.; Geng, S.; Zhang, R.; Ma, T.; Fang, R.; Zhang, Y.; Li, H.; and Qiao, Y. 2024. Clip-adapter: Better vision-language models with feature adapters. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 132(2): 581–595.

Gao, X.; Gao, F.; Tao, D.; and Li, X. 2013. Universal blind image quality assessment metrics via natural scene statistics and multiple kernel learning. *IEEE Transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 24(12).

Ghadiyaram, D.; and Bovik, A. C. 2014. Blind image quality assessment on real distorted images using deep belief nets. In 2014 IEEE global conference on signal and information processing (GlobalSIP), 946–950. IEEE.

Ghadiyaram, D.; and Bovik, A. C. 2015. Massive online crowdsourced study of subjective and objective picture quality. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 25(1): 372–387.

Ghadiyaram, D.; and Bovik, A. C. 2017. Perceptual quality prediction on authentically distorted images using a bag of features approach. *Journal of vision*, 17(1): 32–32.

Golestaneh, S. A.; Dadsetan, S.; and Kitani, K. M. 2022. No-reference image quality assessment via transformers, relative ranking, and self-consistency. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, 1220–1230.

Guo, L.; Wang, C.; Yang, W.; Huang, S.; Wang, Y.; Pfister, H.; and Wen, B. 2023. Shadowdiffusion: When degradation prior meets diffusion model for shadow removal. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 14049–14058.

Ho, J.; Jain, A.; and Abbeel, P. 2020. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 6840–6851.

Hosu, V.; Lin, H.; Sziranyi, T.; and Saupe, D. 2020. KonIQ-10k: An ecologically valid database for deep learning of blind image quality assessment. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 29: 4041–4056.

Kang, L.; Ye, P.; Li, Y.; and Doermann, D. 2014. Convolutional neural networks for no-reference image quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 1733–1740.

Ke, B.; Obukhov, A.; Huang, S.; Metzger, N.; Daudt, R. C.; and Schindler, K. 2023. Repurposing diffusion-based image generators for monocular depth estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02145*.

Ke, J.; Wang, Q.; Wang, Y.; Milanfar, P.; and Yang, F. 2021. Musiq: Multi-scale image quality transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 5148–5157.

Kim, J.; and Lee, S. 2016. Fully deep blind image quality predictor. *IEEE Journal of selected topics in signal processing*, 11(1): 206–220.

Kim, J.; Zeng, H.; Ghadiyaram, D.; Lee, S.; Zhang, L.; and Bovik, A. C. 2017. Deep convolutional neural models for picture-quality prediction: Challenges and solutions to datadriven image quality assessment. *IEEE Signal processing magazine*, 34(6): 130–141.

Li, A. C.; Prabhudesai, M.; Duggal, S.; Brown, E.; and Pathak, D. 2023. Your diffusion model is secretly a zero-shot classifier. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2206–2217.

Li, X.; Zheng, J.; Hu, R.; Zhang, Y.; Li, K.; Shen, Y.; Zheng, X.; Liu, Y.; Zhang, S.; Dai, P.; et al. 2024. Feature Denoising Diffusion Model for Blind Image Quality Assessment. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2401.11949.

Lin, K.-Y.; and Wang, G. 2018. Hallucinated-IQA: Noreference image quality assessment via adversarial learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 732–741.

Luo, Z.; Gustafsson, F. K.; Zhao, Z.; Sjölund, J.; and Schön, T. B. 2023. Controlling Vision-Language Models for Multi-Task Image Restoration. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. Ma, K.; Liu, W.; Zhang, K.; Duanmu, Z.; Wang, Z.; and Zuo, W. 2017. End-to-end blind image quality assessment using deep neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 27(3): 1202–1213.

Madhusudana, P. C.; Birkbeck, N.; Wang, Y.; Adsumilli, B.; and Bovik, A. C. 2022. Image quality assessment using contrastive learning. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 31: 4149–4161.

Mittal, A.; Moorthy, A. K.; and Bovik, A. C. 2012. Noreference image quality assessment in the spatial domain. *IEEE Transactions on image processing*, 21(12): 4695–4708.

Moorthy, A. K.; and Bovik, A. C. 2010. A two-step framework for constructing blind image quality indices. *IEEE Signal processing letters*, 17(5): 513–516.

Moorthy, A. K.; and Bovik, A. C. 2011. Blind image quality assessment: From natural scene statistics to perceptual quality. *IEEE transactions on Image Processing*, 20(12): 3350–3364.

Mou, C.; Wang, X.; Xie, L.; Wu, Y.; Zhang, J.; Qi, Z.; and Shan, Y. 2024. T2i-adapter: Learning adapters to dig out more controllable ability for text-to-image diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, 4296–4304.

Pan, D.; Shi, P.; Hou, M.; Ying, Z.; Fu, S.; and Zhang, Y. 2018. Blind predicting similar quality map for image quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 6373–6382.

Peng, F.; Fu, H.; Ming, A.; Wang, C.; Ma, H.; He, S.; Dou, Z.; and Chen, S. 2024. Aigc image quality assessment via imageprompt correspondence. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, volume 6.

Qin, G.; Hu, R.; Liu, Y.; Zheng, X.; Liu, H.; Li, X.; and Zhang, Y. 2023. Data-efficient image quality assessment with attention-panel decoder. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, 2091–2100.

Radford, A.; Kim, J. W.; Hallacy, C.; Ramesh, A.; Goh, G.; Agarwal, S.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Mishkin, P.; Clark, J.; et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, 8748–8763. PMLR.

Ren, H.; Chen, D.; and Wang, Y. 2018. RAN4IQA: Restorative adversarial nets for no-reference image quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32.

Rombach, R.; Blattmann, A.; Lorenz, D.; Esser, P.; and Ommer, B. 2022. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 10684–10695.

Saad, M. A.; Bovik, A. C.; and Charrier, C. 2010. A DCT statistics-based blind image quality index. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 17(6): 583–586.

Saad, M. A.; Bovik, A. C.; and Charrier, C. 2012. Blind image quality assessment: A natural scene statistics approach in the DCT domain. *IEEE transactions on Image Processing*, 21(8): 3339–3352.

Sadiq, A.; Nizami, I. F.; Anwar, S. M.; and Majid, M. 2020. Blind image quality assessment using natural scene statistics of stationary wavelet transform. *Optik*, 205: 164189.

Saha, A.; Mishra, S.; and Bovik, A. C. 2023. Re-iqa: Unsupervised learning for image quality assessment in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 5846–5855.

Su, S.; Yan, Q.; Zhu, Y.; Zhang, C.; Ge, X.; Sun, J.; and Zhang, Y. 2020. Blindly assess image quality in the wild guided by a self-adaptive hyper network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 3667–3676.

Tan, M.; and Le, Q. 2019. Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, 6105–6114. PMLR.

Tian, J.; Aggarwal, L.; Colaco, A.; Kira, Z.; and Gonzalez-Franco, M. 2023. Diffuse, attend, and segment: Unsupervised zero-shot segmentation using stable diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12469*.

Varga, D.; Saupe, D.; and Szirányi, T. 2018. DeepRN: A content preserving deep architecture for blind image quality assessment. In 2018 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME), 1–6. IEEE.

Wang, J.; Chan, K. C.; and Loy, C. C. 2023. Exploring clip for assessing the look and feel of images. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, 2555–2563.

Wang, J.; Yue, Z.; Zhou, S.; Chan, K. C.; and Loy, C. C. 2023. Exploiting diffusion prior for real-world image super-resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07015*.

Wang, Z.; Hu, B.; Zhang, M.; Li, J.; Li, L.; Gong, M.; and Gao, X. 2024. Diffusion Model Based Visual Compensation Guidance and Visual Difference Analysis for No-Reference Image Quality Assessment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14401*.

Xiao, J.; Feng, R.; Zhang, H.; Liu, Z.; Yang, Z.; Zhu, Y.; Fu, X.; Zhu, K.; Liu, Y.; and Zha, Z.-J. ???? DreamClean: Restoring Clean Image Using Deep Diffusion Prior. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Xu, K.; Liao, L.; Xiao, J.; Chen, C.; Wu, H.; Yan, Q.; and Lin, W. 2024. Boosting Image Quality Assessment through Efficient Transformer Adaptation with Local Feature Enhancement. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2662–2672.

Xue, W.; Mou, X.; Zhang, L.; Bovik, A. C.; and Feng, X. 2014. Blind image quality assessment using joint statistics of gradient magnitude and Laplacian features. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 23(11): 4850–4862.

Ying, Z.; Niu, H.; Gupta, P.; Mahajan, D.; Ghadiyaram, D.; and Bovik, A. 2020. From patches to pictures (PaQ-2-PiQ): Mapping the perceptual space of picture quality. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 3575–3585.

You, J.; and Korhonen, J. 2021. Transformer for image quality assessment. In 2021 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP), 1389–1393. IEEE.

Zhang, L.; Zhang, L.; and Bovik, A. C. 2015. A featureenriched completely blind image quality evaluator. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 24(8): 2579–2591.

Zhang, W.; Ma, K.; Yan, j.; Deng, D.; and Wang, Z. 2018. Blind image quality assessment using a deep bilinear convolutional neural network. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 30.

Zhang, W.; Zhai, G.; Wei, Y.; Yang, X.; and Ma, K. 2023. Blind image quality assessment via vision-language correspondence: A multitask learning perspective. In *Proceedings* of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 14071–14081.

Zhao, K.; Yuan, K.; Sun, M.; Li, M.; and Wen, X. 2023a. Quality-aware pre-trained models for blind image quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 22302–22313.

Zhao, W.; Rao, Y.; Liu, Z.; Liu, B.; Zhou, J.; and Lu, J. 2023b. Unleashing text-to-image diffusion models for visual perception. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 5729–5739.

Zhou, K.; Yang, J.; Loy, C. C.; and Liu, Z. 2022. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9): 2337–2348.

Zhu, H.; Li, L.; Wu, J.; Dong, W.; and Shi, G. 2020. MetaIQA: Deep meta-learning for no-reference image quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 14143–14152.

Zhu, Y.; Ma, H.; Peng, J.; Liu, D.; and Xiong, Z. 2021. Recycling discriminator: Towards opinion-unaware image quality assessment using Wasserstein GAN. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 116–125.

# A Text template

Word types	Details
Scenes	animal cityscape, human, indoor, landscape, night, plant, still_life, other
Distortion type	jpeg2000 compression, jpeg compression, motion, white noise, gaussian blur, fastfading, fnoise, lens, diffusion, shifting, color quantization, desaturation oversaturation, underexposure, overexposure, contrast, white noise with color, impulse, multiplicative, jitter, white noise with denoise, brighten, darken, pixelate, shifting the mean, noneccentricity patch, quantization, color blocking, sharpness, realistic blur, realistic noise, realistic contrast change, other realistic, other
Quality level	bad, poor, fair, good, perfect

Table 8: Details of the text template we use in the experiment.

# **B** Training details

Model	CLIVE	KonIQ	LIVEFB	SPAQ
Teacher	-	5	2	-
Student	10, 25	5	4	6

Table 9: Learning rate decay at which epoch. The scheduler is MultiStepLR, decay factor is 0.2. The validation step for CLIVE is 50 while for other datasets is 250.

# **C** Experiment implementation

Variable	Value	Explanation
Η	512	Height of the input image
W	512	Width of the input image
$l_s$	11	The number of elements in {scenes}
$l_d$	35	The number of elements in {distortion type}
$l_q$	5	The number of elements in {quality level}
$\dot{K}$	1925	The total number of combinations of text templates
d	768	Output dimension of the CLIP encoder
$\lambda$	0.25	Coefficient used to control the margin

Table 10: The values of the numeric variables defined in Sec.3.

# D Standard deviation of experimental results

Dataset	CL	IVE	Ko	nIQ	LIV	EFB	SP	AQ
Metrics	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC
Ours(student)	0.002	0.009	0.003	0.005	0.008	0.007	0.002	0.003

Table 11: The standard deviation of the results from Table 1.

Training on	LIV	EFB	CLIVE	KonIQ	
Testing on	KonIQ	CLIVE	KonIQ	CLIVE	
Ours(student) Ours(teacher)	0.005 0.003	0.008 0.012	0.001 0.021	0.009 0.011	

- Table 12: The standard deviation of the results from Table 2.

Dataset	Full		w/o TP		w/o CCE		w/o TA		w/o IA	
1	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC
CLIVE CLIVE	0.005	0.011	0.009	0.011	0.009	0.013	0.008	0.009	0.006	0.014

Table 13: The standard deviation of the results from Table 3.

	Timestep										
Dataset	1		5		10		20		50		
	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	
CLIVE	0.005	0.011	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.009	0.010	0.015	0.016	0.017	
KonIQ	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.010	

Table 14: The standard deviation of the results from Table 4.

Dataset	FiFi	ull	w/o	$f_{\rm up}^{t,1}$	w/o	$f_{\rm up}^{t,2}$	w/o	$f_{\rm up}^{t,3}$	w/o	$f_{\rm up}^{t,4}$
	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC
CLIVE	0.005	0.011	0.007	0.009	0.005	0.009	0.005	0.013	0.005	0.011
KonIQ	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.004	0.002	0.003

Table 15: The standard deviation of the results from Table 5.

Dataset	Distilled	l student	w/o distillation loss		
	PLCC	SRCC	PLCC	SRCC	
CLIVE	0.002	0.009	0.013	0.022	
KonIQ	0.003	0.005	0.002	0.004	

Table 16: The standard deviation of the results from Table 6.